

1 Souhegan Cooperative School Board

2 Monday, October 22nd, 2018

3 Meeting Minutes – Approved 11 26 18

4 Administrative Team: Adam Steel- Associate Superintendent/Business Administrator, Christine
5 Landwehrle-Assistant Superintendent, Natalie Berger- Dean of Faculty, Meg Beauchamp-
6 Director of Student Services, and Kelly Driscoll- Dean of Students.

7 Souhegan Cooperative School Board: Jim Manning- Chair, Pim Grondstra- Vice Chair, Steve
8 Coughlan- Secretary, David Chen, Amy Facey, Howard Brown and Dwayne Purvis (Via phone)

9 Minute Taker: Danae Marotta

10 Public: Jeanne Ludt, Amherst NH and Community Members

11 I. Call to Order

12 **Chair Mr. Jim Manning called the meeting to order at 6:06PM**

13 II. Public Input

14 No Public Comment

15 III. Superintendent's Report

16 Superintendent Mr. Adam Steel welcomed the public and reminded the Board to use their
17 microphones as the audio can be tough to hear for the viewers at home.

18 He discussed that you can see the new emergency call stations, significant work with the
19 Advisory program and numerous other technological improvements have been made. They are
20 continuing to move forward.

21 He added that there was a talk about theft, there were 3 incidents that he was aware of and then
22 two investigations that have been conducted.

23 Mr. Brown added that he liked the format that he sent out on Friday. He then asked about the
24 SAU budget.

25 Mr. Steel added that it will be presented at the SAU meeting.

26 Mr. Chen asked about the Treasurer's Report and asked about the Unexpended Fund Balance. He
27 added that he is looking for an ongoing update.

28 Superintendent Steel noted that they are looking at better processes to come up with that amount
29 throughout the course of the school year.

30 He then got Mr. Dwayne Purvis on the phone.

31 The Board thanked Superintendent Steel for his report.

32 IV. Principal's Report

33 Ms. Kelly Driscoll, Dean of Students, and Ms. Natalie Berger, Dean of Faculty, are here for any
34 questions.

35 Mr. Manning asked Mr. Purvis if he was alone and if it was unreasonable for him to be here.

36 Mr. Purvis replied, yes to both.

37 Mr. Manning noted that they are on the Principal's Report.

38 Ms. Facey added that it was great that the teachers went to a PACE conference, but wanted to
39 hear from building leadership about the 9th and 10th grade on deeper learning.

40 Dean of Faculty, Ms. Natalie Berger explained that they have been deep into the Empower work
41 and have been meeting with Captains and individual teams in the 9th and 10th grade.

42 Ms. Facey asked what has been done with helping educating students and parents on reporting
43 out.

44 Ms. Berger explained that parents had handbooks in the beginning of the year, also, they have a
45 parent forum this Thursday with Assistant Principal, Ms. Christine Landwehrle. Additionally, as
46 teachers are handing out rubrics and they have been articulating the standards. The biggest shift
47 for the teachers is the software and the shift on the conversion scale. They are trying to use the
48 language consistently about mastery based grading.

49 Mr. Chen asked about a comparison between the A's and 3's, a retrospective look.

50 Ms. Berger replied, they could, but she is not sure how valid it would be. It is the whole shift into
51 standards based grading.

52 Ms. Landwehrle added that was the change in the conversion scale. Now, the standards are more
53 rigorous.

54 Mr. Manning asked Mr. Purvis if he had any questions.

55 Mr. Purvis had no further questions.

56 Ms. Facey noted that the Journalism Conference was great and thanked Mr. Adam Theriault,
57 English/Media Arts Teacher, for the fantastic program.

58 The Board thanked Ms. Berger.

59 V. Consent Agenda

60 Mr. Brown pulled the 1. September 24th Draft Minutes.

61 He noted that he was not listed in attendance.

62 He then noted the change in Line 12 from "*Celled*" changed to "*Called*".

63 Ms. Facey noted that she was not listed in the Non-Public Session attendance.

64 **Mr. Steve Coughlan motioned to accept the Consent Agenda 1. Minutes, September 24th**
65 **2018, as amended, 2. Treasurer's Report 3. Q1 Expenditure Report 4. Trip Approvals –**

66 **Trip to Peru, Tanzania, Joshua Tree Park and Germany and 5. Approve Policies –**
 67 **EBB/Add, EEAA, EFA, EFAA, GBEF, GCO, IFA, IHAMA, IHBG-R, IHCD/LEG, IJ, IK,**
 68 **IKFA, ILD, IMBD, IMDA, JBAA, JICL, JLI-EB, JRA, & KLG. Mr. Pim Grondstra**
 69 **seconded the motion. 6 in Favor, Motion passed.**

70 **Mr. Jim Manning called a Roll call: Manning-Yes, Grondstra- Yes, Coughlan- Yes, Facey-**
 71 **Yes, Brown-Yes, Chen-Yes, Purvis-Abstain.**

72 VI. Deeper Learning- Math Evaluation Update

73 Superintendent Steel noted that in the past the Board had authorized some funds for math for a
 74 math evaluation about 6 months ago.

75 Assistant Superintendent, Ms. Christine Landwehrle discussed that she has been working with
 76 two consultants this summer and looking at SAT compared to NWEA data. They are using the
 77 college and career benchmark for math and that is 530. Right now, the scores have been
 78 increasing, but the comp districts are 65-70% meeting benchmark. That was one set point and
 79 why do we not have that percentage meeting that benchmark. \

80 They are crafting a Teacher survey and hope to get it out in December. They are looking for
 81 grade 11 students to survey about 50-60 students. They want them to have enough experience in
 82 math at SHS.

83 Mr. Chen asked about the 11th grade assessment.

84 Ms. Landwehrle replied that this is getting information from them, and if they see themselves as
 85 a good math student.

86 Mr. Chen suggested they could be correlated.

87 Ms. Landwehrle added that it is a random sampling of about 50 students and they are looking for
 88 feedback.

89 Mr. Chen asked about the NH College Readiness, Math is 530.

90 Ms. Landwehrle replied that they had 61% at 530 or above.

91 Mr. Chen asked about the difference between college readiness now.

92 Ms. Landwehrle replied that it is different and she will go into more depth on that. She added
 93 that with NWEA they have expected proficiency on the SAT, they just released that last year.
 94 She is not sure, since that was a brand new feature last year.

95 Mr. Brown asked about going back and looking at the survey.

96 Ms. Landwehrle added that there are ID numbers, correlation was not the intention of the survey.

97 Mr. Purvis asked about the percentile and is there any correlation to a certain percentile to a
 98 certain college.

99 Ms. Landwehrle replied, that they do not have comparative district data, and that might be
100 helpful. What is challenging with the percentile score is that it is done at the individual level.

101 Mr. Manning added that the SAT presentation is coming up.

102 He asked the Board if they had further questions.

103 The Board had no further questions.

104 VII. School Culture and Climate- Advisory Presentation

105 Already completed.

106 VIII. Learner/Student Growth- SAT Results

107 Ms. Landwehrle discussed that she does not have the comparative district data at this time, they
108 only have the State level results.

109 She then went over the Reading and Writing SAT results- Spring 2018-Grade 11 Students. She
110 explained that they have 87% meeting the Grade 11 and 84% percent meeting Grade 12
111 benchmark.

112 She then explained the Math SAT Results 2018- Grade 11 Students. They have 69% of students
113 meeting the Grade 11 (510) Benchmark and 61% percent meeting the Grade 12 (530)
114 Benchmark. It is significantly higher than the State.

115 Ms. Landwehrle explained the longitudinal view of Reading Assessment. They are different
116 cohorts of students. They had NECAP in 2014, the old state assessment not to new standards.
117 You can see that we are pretty consistent and they have steady progress with the evidence based
118 reading and writing.

119 With the Math Longitudinal Assessment, you can see that they were disadvantaged in earlier
120 years and are now aligned to the State Standards. They are getting in range with their comp
121 districts. She added that it will be interesting to see their math evaluation. They are steadily
122 climbing and the comp districts were around 65-70% of students meeting benchmarks in prior
123 years. They are headed in the right direction.

124 Mr. Grondstra asked about the Grade 11 and Grade 12, and if they are the same cohort.

125 Ms. Landwehrle replied, yes. This is the same test; it is just that they had 8% more students
126 reaching the grade 11 benchmark because it is less rigorous. She added that it is confusing
127 though.

128 Mr. Chen asked about going back and looking at the 8th grade.

129 Ms. Landwehrle replied that is what the math evaluation is going to do. They can go back 10
130 years with NWEA data.

131 Mr. Manning asked if they are going to consistently use NWEA growth.

132 Ms. Landwehrle explained, NWEA gives them both growth and achievement. The only
133 challenge is that 9th and 10th grade students take it in the Fall.

134 Mr. Manning asked about the longitudinal reading assessment.

135 Ms. Landwehrle replied that most of their comp districts are in the 65-70%.

136 Mr. Manning added what would like to get into the mid to high 80%. He asked how could they
137 can find a way to get the kids to the mid to high 80's. He asked if there are barriers.

138 Ms. Landwehrle replied, that the benchmarks are different for math than in literacy. She added
139 that she thinks that Hanover is in the 90's. They can be looking at NWEA to help give them
140 insight.

141 Mr. Brown asked if they can look at Hanover and their earlier grades.

142 Ms. Landwehrle explained that reading spirals. With math, you are building a foundation and if
143 you miss a step you have to go back to the beginning. They are seeing huge increases in K-2 but
144 not in Grade 4. What she has heard is that parents in Hanover get tutors for their students. If you
145 look at Hollis and Windham, they are in the 60% for college and career readiness.

146 Mr. Chen agreed that Hanover is definitely an outlier. He then suggested that they use a metric
147 with nearby districts.

148 Ms. Landwehrle added that she looked back at the comp district data to see what that was. In
149 2017 and they were at 54% and are now at 61%. They should be at 65-70% for a range for math.

150 The Board thanked Ms. Landwehrle.

151 IX. Learner Agency- Community Council Update

152 Mr. Steel noted that they did this last month.

153 X. Operational Effectiveness- FY 20 Budget

154 Superintendent Steel explained that they start with the profile of their graduates. He noted that
155 they want to be the place where they take students farther than they can go anywhere else.

156 He added that they talked a lot about Deeper Learning, Climate and Culture and Learner Agency.

157 He then discussed a slide that he showed at the SAU Meeting talking about strategic planning.
158 The budget needs to be reflective of where they are heading.

159 Second, they look at is enrollment. They are mindful of the drop and they need to discuss with
160 the declining enrollment and then the increase in 2025. The enrollment is essentially flat
161 compared to this year. There will need to be further conversation on how to be flexible.

162 There is a small reduction in staffing as efficiency gains are expected.

163 The Proposed Budget is down with the exception of special education, there is no difference
164 between the default and the proposed budget. There is a net increase of 0.3% from FY 19. With
165 the exception of special education, the rest of the budget is down \$181,305 (-1.00%).

166 Proposed budget would have an estimated cost per pupil increase of 2.8% and would close the
167 gap between the State average and Souhegan by 2%.

168 This is the budget by the AFC Categories of Curriculum, Special Education, Athletics,
169 Administration, Technology, Facilities, and Food/Transportation. Almost all functional areas are
170 down.

171 He then explained the Enrollment vs. Budget Growth.

172 Superintendent Steel explained the Cost per Pupil projection with the State Average and
173 Enrollment.

174 He noted that Mr. Chen had asked what would the budget look like if they were to reach a 2%
175 increase in CCP. That would be a reduction of \$125,000 from the proposed budget and remove a
176 teaching position. With a 0% increase in CPP, they would have a reduction of \$435,000 from the
177 proposed budget and lose approximately 6.0 FTE's.

178 There are some position changes included, the addition of a special education case manager,
179 special education behavior specialist, and special education instructional assistants, they already
180 exist today but need to be budgeted for. They will be looking in the spring to reduce two in order
181 to offset the additional costs.

182 They have taken out items in abeyance. He is in support of these items and they are trying to find
183 it in this year's budget is possible. They are needed and could be added back in the proposed
184 budget if the school board so chooses.

185 He then reviewed the proposed budget calculation, with the default budget, noting that they took
186 out the previous year's warrant article and the difference is \$514.

187 He concluded by stating that he emailed the Board and the AFC all of the data and slide
188 presentation. He is looking for feedback and the AFC is ready to start work and make their
189 recommendations with a presentation.

190 Mr. Coughlan asked if they were going to do assignments.

191 Mr. Grondstra asked who is going to come up with the meetings.

192 Superintendent Steel noted that he is going to coordinate and attend the meetings if he can.
193 Director of Finance, Ms. Katie Hannan, has also agreed to attend if possible.

194 Mr. Chen commented that the default and the regular budget are generally the same. He asked
195 what happened.

196 Mr. Steel replied, because there are no changes in staffing and he has taken things out to keep
197 them the same.

198 Mr. Manning noted that there are no staffing changes and the default is the same because of it.

199 Mr. Steel explained that the new staff are in the proposed budget. He added that the instructional
200 assistants are in the default calculation because they exist today, he suggested that Mr. Chen
201 think of them separately.

202 Mr. Chen asked if the middle school is going to have a net decrease.

203 Mr. Steel replied they are not going to have a net decrease because they have new students
204 coming from the elementary schools.

205 Mr. Brown asked about the health insurance that usually gets added in every year.

206 Mr. Steel responded that most of that is under Employer Paid Benefits, 10.6%. He will not need
207 to update it in the future as they already received the rate.

208 Mr. Chen asked about the Master Schedule.

209 Mr. Steel noted that he would be happy to share that with the Board.

210 Mr. Chen asked if they have looked at that the senior level impact.

211 Superintendent Steel added that he will send Mr. Chen data.

212 Mr. Manning asked about the matrix of Subcommittees.

213 Mr. Steel added that they have 7 subcommittees.

- 214 1. Athletics- Pim Grondstra
- 215 2. Curriculum- Dwayne Purvis
- 216 3. Technology- Howard Brown
- 217 4. Special Education- David Chen
- 218 5. Food/ Transportation- Steve Coughlan
- 219 6. Administration- Amy Facey
- 220 7. Facilities-Jim Manning

221 Mr. Purvis asked if they would be able to see the comment section with the budget changes in
222 the spreadsheet.

223 Superintendent Steel replied, yes.

224 The Board thanked Superintendent Steel.

225 XI. Early Retirement Incentive

226 Superintendent Steel added that there was a change this year and asked if the Board wanted to
227 offer this incentive to the PPC as soon as the end of this school year.

228 Mr. Manning asked for discussion.

229 Mr. Coughlan commented that he was against it.

230 Mr. Manning asked what is the retirement incentive.

231 Mr. Coughlan explained that there are 4 ways for teachers to give their retirement.

232 Ms. Facey asked in case of a reduction of force it allows some teachers to exit and not be forced
233 to go. That is why they waited from last month to this month to talk about it tonight. She likes
234 having the option to offer it at some point. It can potentially be useful, but not this year it sounds
235 like.

236 Mr. Brown asked if the PPC wanted this.

237 Mr. Coughlan noted that a plan like this has been a desire by the staff.

238 Mr. Brown asked about the dollar amount.

239 Mr. Coughlan added that amount might change and they might want to level up. It is a 30%
240 incentive with a cap of \$20K.

241 Mr. Chen asked about the limit in one year.

242 Mr. Coughlan added that they can pick the number.

243 Mr. Chen asked how do they do that, is that during budget time.

244 Mr. Manning explained that it is a short window and is slightly different.

245 Mr. Coughlan added that they have to have 15 years of service and at least 55 years of age.

246 Ms. Facey added that it gives them an option.

247 Mr. Manning asked if they can take a straw poll.

248 Superintendent Steel replied, yes, they can certainly do that.

249 Mr. Chen remarked that he generally likes the concept but he needs more time to think about the
250 scenarios. He would not want to vote on it tonight, and ask Mr. Coughlan more questions.

251 Mr. Manning explained that they can choose to do nothing tonight.

252 Mr. Coughlan added that there is no harm in doing nothing now. He then suggested that they
253 discuss this in the June Meeting and gives the teachers time.

254 Mr. Purvis asked about the Master Schedule. He noted that he was in favor of taking no action at
255 this time.

256 Mr. Coughlan suggested the Board look at policy GCBD for more clarification.

257 Mr. Manning commented that this discussion was beneficial and the Board will revisit this
258 conversation in the future.

259 XII. District Consolidation Discussion

260 Superintendent Steel explained that he has spoken with the MV and Amherst. He is here to
261 gather Board feedback.

262 Mr. Manning added that it is his recommendation that they not proceed with consolidation until
263 they have a better sense from the people of MV and the Board. There might be some other things
264 that they can look at to get them to common ground to where they need to go.

265 Mr. Coughlan added that he has been working on consolidation for a long time and they have the
266 easiest job, it doesn't force their decision to do anything.

267 Mr. Brown asked if Mr. Steel can share what the MV thoughts were.

268 Superintendent Steel discussed that the MV board had questions and they were not ready to
269 check the box yes, at least this year and in the current form. The Amherst School Board had
270 mixed impressions as well. They seemed largely in favor but had questions about alternative
271 solutions between the ASD and SCCD. They are going to seek legal counsel.

272 Mr. Brown asked for the articles of agreement.

273 Superintendent Steel replied, he has those articles of agreement and can certainly send them out.

274 Mr. Manning discussed that they are forgetting the reasoning behind it. If they are going to the
275 public, they need to get better with the reasoning. Internally, they have a sense of what they are
276 trying to achieve, and they haven't been able to package it as a story.

277 Mr. Purvis suggested they know the benefits and the consequences.

278 Ms. Facey asked what are the next steps.

279 Mr. Steel replied that they will bring it back to the SAU Board next month and seek guidance
280 from there.

281 Mr. Brown added that they all still need to talk about it.

282 Mr. Steel echoed Mr. Brown.

283 Mr. Brown noted that is where they can talk about it.

284 Mr. Steel commented that each Board Chair needs to report back out on behalf of their Board.

285 Mr. Purvis asked where can the public go to give their input.

286 Mr. Manning added that the public will get to do that at some point. They need to be clear on
287 what they want to do and how they are going to do it. He advised against going to the public with
288 an incomplete idea.

289 Mr. Purvis added that this has been an ongoing discussion.

290 Mr. Chen asked if they have to do it in line with the fiscal year.

291 Superintendent Steel replied, yes.

292 The Board thanked Superintendent Steel.

293 XIII. Public Comment

294 Ms. Jeanne Ludt, Amherst NH, asked if they going to provide a cost benefit analysis for
295 consolidation.

296 Superintendent Steel replied, yes, absolutely. He provided numbers two years ago that showed
297 modest savings. He noted that it should not be their only factor in consideration.

298 The Board thanked Ms. Ludt for her comments.

299 XIV. Board Communication

300 Superintendent Steel wanted to show the Board, the Trello platform with attachments. They are
301 building agendas with this and all board members should have access. If they are having
302 problems he will be happy to assist them.

303 Mr. Chen asked if it is Trello.com.

304 Mr. Manning added that they have a Trello app, and you can sign on with your Sprise account.

305 Mr. Manning asked if the Board had any questions.

306 The Board had no further questions and thanked Superintendent Steel.

307 XV. Non-Public Session RSA 91-A:3 II (i)

308 **Mr. Howard Brown motioned to enter into Non-Public Session RSA 91-A:3 II (i) at 8:00**
309 **PM. Ms. Amy Facey seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, motion passed.**

310 **Mr. Manning called a Roll Call: Manning-Yes, Grondstra- Yes, Coughlan-Yes, Facey-Yes,**
311 **Chen-Yes, Brown-Yes, and Purvis-Yes.**

312 **Non Public Meeting -Motioned by Ms. Amy Facey and Seconded by Mr. Howard Brown to**
313 **adjourn. The vote was unanimous and passed. Meeting adjourned 8:30PM.**